

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

STEVE CRUMP,

No. C 14-5019 RS (PR)  
No. C 15-0724 RS (PR)

Petitioner,

## **ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

V.

DANIEL PARAMO, Warden,

### Respondent.

10        These two federal habeas corpus actions, each of which alleges claims  
11 identical to those presented in many prior petitions, e.g., 11-4920 RS, 11-5084 RS, and  
12 13-0010 RS, will be dismissed as premature. They are not ready for review because  
13 petitioner's direct appeal is pending, the state appellate court having refused to grant his  
14 request to dismiss his appeal. (No. C 15-0724, Pet. at 20.) Therefore, as the Court has  
15 informed petitioner in many prior orders, abstention is appropriate because the petitions show  
16 no reason justifying this Court's interference in on-going state proceedings. *See Younger v.*  
17 *Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43–54 (1971). The motions to proceed *in forma pauperis* are  
18 GRANTED. The petitions are DISMISSED.

19 A certificate of appealability will not issue. Petitioner has not shown “that jurists of  
20 reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a  
21 constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court  
22 was correct in its procedural ruling.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).  
23 The Clerk shall terminate all pending motions, enter judgment in favor of respondent in each  
24 action, and close the files.

## IT IS SO ORDERED

26 | DATED: February 26, 2015

  
RICHARD SEEBORG  
United States District Judge

No. C 14-5019 RS (PR)  
No. C 15-0724 RS (PR)  
ORDER OF DISMISSAL